UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

News from Russia

By SYDNEY STRONG

The Disloyalty of Stambulisky

By NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

The Function of the Sermon in the Life of the Community

By GEORGE GILMOUR

VOLUME XCII NUMBER 7

Chicago, November 1, 1923

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES *: Editors :* FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
Curtis W. Reese
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Robert B. Whitaker
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lucidi
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement printed November 3rd, 1921, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss) _____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 99
Jottings.—J. H. H. 101
Editorial Correspondence—
News from Russia.—REV. SYDNEY STRONG... 102

ARTICLES—
The Disloyalty of Stambulisky.—NATHANIEL SCHMIDT 105
The Function of the Sermon in the Life of the Community.—REV. GEORGE GILMOUR 106

THE STUDY TABLE—
"Anthony John."—Review by HARRIET T. COMSTOCK 109
"Because Men Are Not Stones."—Review by EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD 109

POETRY—
Poem.—*William Blake* 99
To C. F. D.—NATHAN HASKELL DOLE 108
The Winds of God.—ROBERT WHITAKER 108

CORRESPONDENCE—
Regarding Universities and "Acquired Characters."—DAVID STARR JORDAN 110
Perpetuating a Dangerous Fallacy.—LUCIA AMES MEAD 110
Another "Test Case."—DIANA AGABEG APCAR 111

THE FIELD—
World Court Main Theme of National Church Congress 111

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. XCII. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 1923 NUMBER 7

But vain the Sword and vain the Bow,
They never can work War's overthrow.
The Hermit's Prayer and the Widow's Tear
Alone can free the World from fear.

For a Tear is an Intellectual Thing,
And a Sigh is the Sword of an Angel King,
And the bitter groan of the Martyr's woe
Is an arrow from the Almightie's bow.

—William Blake.

Germany is breaking up fast, and nobody cares. Cares enough, at least, to save one of the really great peoples of the world from decay and death! It is interesting, almost ghoulishly interesting to study the attitudes of different groups of men and women toward the tragedy now well under way. One very large body of persons still living in the war-atmosphere of hatred and revenge; they still think of the Germans as "Huns" who were exclusively responsible for the war and all its horrors, and ask for nothing better than that they be wiped completely off the face of the earth. Another group is persuaded that the Germans are "quitters," deliberately engaged in the nefarious business of evading the payment of the obligations imposed upon them by the Treaty of Versailles; they have plenty of money, and abundance of assets hidden away, and therefore should be forced at the point of the sword to disgorge. Still another group, somewhat questioning the justice and the wisdom of French policy, find comfort in the thought that the Germans are a well-disciplined people, and can therefore endure an indefinite amount of misery without resorting to the desperate remedies of either white or red revolution; they are being pretty roughly used, is the argument, but they can be safely trusted to pull through without disaster. With none of these viewpoints, let us now say, have we the slightest sympathy. The people who hold to them do not live in a real world at all, but only in a world of ugly and vain imagination. The Germans are not "Huns" any more than the rest of us; they are not able to pay the reparations exacted, as all competent and impartial students of the problem have long since demonstrated; they are not going to endure forever the horrors heaped upon them, but do speedily as the stolid Russians did in 1917. Even if not out of sympathy for the Germans, one would think that in sheer self-defense men would rally to the situation. Or is it actually possible that we do not see that the crash of Germany means disaster to us all?

Of course, what is happening in Germany these dreadful days constitutes a final revelation of all that French policy has been meaning and intending from the beginning. Poincaré's pious talk about reparations, his disavowal of any desire for the disruption of the Reich and the appropriation of German territory, was always suspected to be dishonest, and is now proved to be dishonest. What is happening in Germany also reveals how much it profited Stresemann and the industrials to abandon passive resistance in the Ruhr at the dictation of the French government. We have already pointed out the treason of the Chancellor's policy—how he betrayed the patient and heroic sufferers in the occupied territory, sold them out as a drover might sell so many cattle on the hoof, therewith abandoning a weapon proved to be effective, and leaving his country "naked to (its) enemies." And now what has he gained —this strong man, this dictator who exacted absolutist power from his distracted countrymen, that he might save them singlehanded? Nothing at all—far less than nothing! The French have refused to negotiate for a settlement of reparations, as any man not a moron—or a dictator!—would have known that they would do. The Rhinelanders, abandoned to the French, have revolted and taken their destinies in their own hands. The Bavarians and Saxons and Thuringians, disgraced and angered by the vile policy of surrender, have smitten their betrayer. It's a fine harvest this German Chancellor has reaped of his folly and cowardice! One wonders hardly what worse could have happened had Stresemann had the courage to stick by the passive resistance policy—and imagines easily what better, infinitely better, *would* have happened. Poincaré, now sure to be elected in the spring elections, would have been beaten; French diplomatic and military policy, now triumphant, would have been humiliated and defeated; Germany, now disrupted, would have been held together by heroic struggle against the enemy, and, by the slow-gathering sympathy of mankind, at last delivered. Our only consolation is that Stresemann lives to see the consequences of his madness.

It would seem as though we had said enough in these columns about the League of Nations. All our readers know how we feel, and why. We are eager, however, to have the record here complete. We want all the testimony in, so that the case against the League,

especially in this wretched Italian business, may be seen in its gross details. We call, therefore, two more witnesses to the stand. The first is Mr. J. L. Garvin, the distinguished English journalist who writes in the *Obeservor*. Speaking as a "professed supporter of the League," and admitting the League's excellent work on many side issues and subordinate questions, he declares that it has now proved its incompetence to bring about a moral reconciliation between peoples, or to replace the reign of war by the reign of law. Analyzing the reasons for failure, he takes us behind the scenes, and shows us what the League of Nations really is. The organization is dominated, he says, by the Executive Council, and this in turn is dominated by the four great powers—Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. But, he points out—

> Japan does not care to meddle too much with the affairs of Europe; Italy in her present phase has other reasons for reserve: France and Britain are left as the sole forces which can actuate the League, but France is concentrated on her own concerns, and the whole spirit of her policy today derives straight from Richelieu and Napoleon. It is the spirit, not of the covenant, but of the older diplomacy backed by arms and alliances. It comes to this: Whenever Great Britain and France agree much can be done; when they differ nothing can be done. France at will can stop or start the machinery of the League.

Our second witness is Israel Zangwill. Speaking in New York City on the Zionist problem, he declared that the League of Nations "is less a League of Nations than a League of Damnations." "Even if Russia and Germany were admitted to it," he said, "and America joined it, it would still be a defective institution so long as its members mutually pledged themselves to maintain the integrity of their existing territories"—i. e., perpetuate the Treaty of Versailles! We think it will be agreed that these criticisms are definite, and that they sustain arguments and assertions long since offered by the editors of UNITY as reasons for opposing the League, and more particularly the entrance of the United States into the League. That the League is to be rejected out of hand, is not contended. Rather is it to be remade as part and parcel of that new program of international accord of which the Outlawry of War is the central feature.

We have recently received a news letter reviewing "international happenings during the summer," from a well-known and ably-officered inter-church organization. In this letter appear the following statements, among others:

> (1) So far as I can gather, every student of world affairs has felt that had not the League (of Nations) been in existence, the event (the trouble between Italy and Greece) would certainly have plunged Europe into war.
>
> (2) When Italy sent her ultimatum to Greece and landed in Corfu . . . the League quietly took the matter in hand.
>
> (3) It is quite evident that both the German Government and the French Government feel that nothing can come out of the situation (in the Ruhr) which has been dragging on for the last six or eight months. . . .

It is to be observed that these statements are statements not of opinion but of *fact*. As such, only one thing is to be said about them, and that is that they are not true. (1) We don't know where the author of this letter "gathers" his information, but the fact is that there is a very even division of opinion among students of world affairs as to the war contingencies in the Graeco-Italian quarrel, and more especially as to the relation of the League's "existence" thereto. (2) "When Italy sent her ultimatum to Greece," the League did not take the matter in hand "quietly" or otherwise. On the contrary, although Greece was appealing for help, the League deliberately passed the whole matter over to the Council of Ambassadors. (3) It is not "evident that both the German Government and the French Government feel that nothing can come out of the (Ruhr) situation." On the contrary, France feels that her two great objects, the ruin of Germany and the capture of the Rhine territory, can come out of that situation, as they are now coming! Opinions may differ in these matters, but there should be no dispute about facts!

Record another triumph for non-resistance! For four months past, the Indian Nationalists have been struggling for the right to bear their national flag on the highways of their own land. During this time, 1645 arrests have been made by the Government, and these have included several women. Through the whole period, however, there was not a suggestion of violence on the part of the Indians.

> "Though every kind of tyranny was tried," says *Swarajya*, "never for a moment did the struggle get out of hand, or lead to rioting or disorder. . . . There was no unnecessary wastage of either energy or men."

The whole of India took up the fight, led of course by the non-co-operators whose position was immeasurably strengthened. Then at last came victory!

> "On the 17th of this month," says *Swarajya*, "a large procession of volunteers, drawn from different parts of India, passed through the hitherto prohibited area, carrying the flag. Though warned in time, the police authorities allowed it to pass without molestation."

The significance of this event is obvious.

> "The honour of the national flag stands vindicated," says the Madras *Journal*, "and our right to take processions on public roads in a peaceful and orderly manner, has been restored."

Restored not by fighting, killing, destroying, but by patient suffering, and courageous acquiescence in bearing evil.

> On all points the Government yielded . . . marking the triumph of truth and non-violence over the organized terrorism of brute force.

Such a victory is a real victory—and a worthy victory. Incidentally it brings new evidence of the vitality and power of Gandhi's non-co-operation movement, the passing of which is so frequently reported in our newspapers.

The recent death of John Morley reminds a British daily newspaper of the fact that he grew up to man-

hood in a period of unusual and splendid activity in English letters. Morley, for example, took his degree at Oxford in the year 1859. In this amazing year there poured from the presses a stream of books which included Darwin's "Origin of Species," Thackeray's "Virginians," Dickens's "Tale of Two Cities," George Eliot's "Adam Bede," George Meredith's "The Ordeal of Richard Feverel," Ruskin's "Two Paths," John Stuart Mill's "Liberty," Fitzgerald's translation of "Omar Khayyám," and Tennyson's "Idylls of the King." There were also volumes of distinguished importance by writers like Matthew Arnold, Charles Kingsley, and Mrs. Gaskell. One wonders how the conscientious reader "kept up" in such a year as this. One is reminded also that something is to be said for the much-despised Victorian Age as compared with this our own. Great books are still being published; years which saw the appearance of Masefield's "The Everlasting Mercy," Hardy's "Moments of Vision," Housman's "Last Poems," Bernard Shaw's "Back to Methuselah," Galsworthy's "Forsyte Saga," Arnold Bennett's "The Old Wives' Tales," "Wells's "Mr. Britling Sees It Through," Hemon's "Maria Chapdelaine," Sinclair Lewis's "Babbitt"—to mention only a few which come easily to mind—are notable. But find if you can a single year in the last forty or even fifty years which has any such abundant record as 1859, or, for that matter, certain other years which might be mentioned in the Victorian span! There was a fertility, a richness, an exuberance, an overflowing energy of creative life in that era, which seems to have disappeared in this more hectic and excited age. What is the matter? Are we degenerate, or simply tired; or is our *èlan vitale* being diverted into other channels? The explanation is hard to find. But, whatever it is, a Golden Age is no longer with us.

A recent report by Dr. I. Garland Penn on the Negro churches in this country, and more particularly on the condition of the Negro ministry, is one which may well stir profound thought upon the part of all who are honestly concerned with the contemporary religious problem. It will be noticed that, while Dr. Penn estimates the membership of Negro churches at 5,000,000, and their property value at $100,000,000, he lays no great stress upon these figures. They may or may not be accurate—probably not; in any case, he moves on to facts and figures in the situation which can be verified. Thus it is known that, in round numbers there are 41,000 Negro churches of various denominations in the United States. Estimating the average length of active ministerial service at twenty-five (25) years, it requires annually 1,600 new men to supply the pulpits of these 41,000 churches. In Negro theological schools having fairly good standards of scholarship, Dr. Penn finds 346 students. An independent investigation by Dean Pratt, of the Howard University School of Religion, uncovered 395 such students. Of these, only 88 were in line for graduation in 1922; and of these, only 16 were college graduates. If the survey is widened to include schools which admit any student who appears regardless of preparation, Dr. Penn finds 940 men who are taking some sort of Bible and elementary theological courses. Dr. Pratt thinks this may be raised to a total of over a 1,000. If a third of these are graduated each year, and all enter the ministry, "we have a total of a little over 300 to supply a demand of 1600... Which means that fully two-thirds of the Negro pulpits are filled by those who have not enjoyed the advantages of theological study"—or, may we add, not filled at all! This is the situation, mind you, in churches where much of the fervor, devotion and sheer compulsion of "the old-time religion" still hangs on! Yet there are those who sit at ease in Zion and say that all is well.

Jottings

Recent developments in Prohibition are certainly heartening to the "drys." The Washington convention, ably planned and conducted by the Federal Council of Churches, and the Conference of Governors summoned by the President, were notable events. Nullification is going to fail just as ignominiously in this case as in certain other well-known cases in American history.

Speaking of Prohibition, we like Governor Pinchot's reminder of the "Whiskey Rebellion" in Washington's time. Our "wet" friends might look up this event in their histories and see what happened.

At a recent Methodist conference in England, Rev. L. E. Keeble moved a "No More War" resolution, which was defeated "by a large majority." In the same paper in which we read this news, we also read of a passionate "No More War" demonstration at Clapham which, says the report, "did not convert the Rector, who replied at an open-air meeting in the evening. He justified the war and the church's part in it, amidst many interruptions and an avalanche of questions." These interruptions and questions are encouraging, if nothing else.

Items like the above give point to a fling by F. P. A. in his famous column, "The Conning Tower," in the New York *World*. He writes:

> There is a law against the advertising of get-rich-quick schemes, but defiance is hurled against it. Those who want to amass wealth are advised to bet that . . . in spite of Lloyd George's appeal to the churches to save the world, they won't do it.

Just so!—and no fault of Lloyd George either.

President Coolidge upholds the policy of General Wood in the Philippines. Of course! Didn't King George III uphold the policy of General Gage in colonial Massachusetts? These imperialistic governments all act just the same.

Over a million dollars was spent by the public to see the World Series baseball games. A half a million dollars was spent to see the Papyrus race. Twelve million dollars have been spent in New York this year to see prize-fights, great and small. What is the matter? Have we all gone crazy?

It is good to see the Congregationalists and the Presbyterians in this country preparing to get together. But what are the Unitarians doing, to allow the Congregationalists thus to swing to the right?

J. H. H.

News from Russia

Editorial Correspondence.

(1) On to Moscow

I should vote for the Berlin to Moscow route via Warsaw. I left Berlin Monday evening 5:13 o'clock and reached Moscow Thursday 3 p. m. This provided for a twelve hours daylight stop in Warsaw. The train service is good—the Russian end being quite as good as other parts, and the fare from Berlin to Moscow including sleepers was less than $15.00. Of course at all frontiers were the usual customs stupidities.

One is fortunate in Warsaw, if he knows the Quakers. My daughter had once been in the service at Widok 26 so that I felt acquainted. I was escorted to the "palace" where the Quakers sleep and dine, and was made "at home." It is striking how these humble Friends are literally occupying the palaces of Europe. There is a reason. They entered Germany, Poland, Austria, Russia, to take the "lowest seats." Behold, they have been called upward—practically the only religious people in Europe, who were trusted.

The Quakers at Warsaw are now specially interested in an Orphanage Scheme, which involves the training of war orphans, to fit them for farming. The government of Poland is co-operating with grants of land, etc. An American check sent to the Quakers, Widok 26, to the "Orphanage Scheme" will in a very practical way literally feed future hungry ones.

On Wednesday at day break, two of the Quakers slipped off the train at a little Polish station, Mary Jackson and Cuthbert Clayton: one to persue her work as teacher at a weaving school, the other to a saw-mill camp 60 miles from the station. In the camp American saws are cutting lumber, to be hauled and put down in front of the lots of peasants whose houses were destroyed by war. The peasants will do the rest.

I had been in Russia a few weeks last December. The country then was snow-bound. I was watching for first impressions. The ride from the frontier to Moscow took 24 hours. The whole country looked good. The railroad bed was well made and showed recent working. One could easily imagine himself traveling through South Dakota. Prices jumped up after crossing the Russian border. Necessities required for travelers, however, cost one-third to one-half less than in America. Hot water at stations is free and must be a great convenience to the tea-drinking Russians. Railway rates differ. The basis for a fare is the "proletarian" rate—the lowest. I bought this to Minsk—partly because all others were taken. I had neglected, however, to buy a "place-card"—my means of conversation to the agent at the other end of the diminutive window being limited to finger signs and grimaces. I have no trouble believing in evolution, since being thrown back upon monkey language to buy a ticket or order a meal. My omission caused the conductor to "fine" me. At Minsk I bought what is called a "soft seat," which involved a sleeper for the night, but no bed-clothes.

On arriving in Moscow I had to wrestle with the porters and driver as with the custom officials. There is however little trouble in all cases, if one will keep his temper and move along with the crowd; not get excited nor think that everyone is trying to "beat" him. There is bound to occur annoying surprises. I was swinging out of the Moscow station, for example, big as life, when a firm looking official directed that my two valises be put on the scales. As I always have a lot of books, I was not surprised when I was asked to pay a neat little sum, for excess luggage, to maintain the railway. At the frontier, a solemn youth, who knew as little English as I Russian, laid aside eight or ten books, like Wells' "Men like Gods," "Huckelberry Finn," Shaws' "Man and Superman," "History of the Church of Russia," Walt Whitman's Poems in German, a Book of Scripture, "His Life"—and I got a bit excited, thinking that stupidity was about to appropriate them. But an overseer came along and with a wave of the hand removed my fear.

In my drive of a mile to the hotel, I watched the crowds. I thought they looked very well. They are not what would be called well dressed. But the people stepped quickly, looked happy and good natured. The many horses on the streets were invariably fat. There were some automobiles—chiefly Fords. The shop-windows were attractively dressed. The apples, plums, grapes—and the bread—offered by the street-vendors looked attractive. The sun shone brightly; on the restaurant car the electric fan was going. I watched several cues of people, at the post office and especially at the State Bank. In contrast with the cues in Berlin, the people were vivacious, joked with each other, and the service at the windows was comparatively speedy.

This is now Sunday, the 2nd of September, I have been here two days. The impression deepens that the people are on the "go." They are hopeful and forward looking. I think if I were a Russian I would not lift a finger to gain "recognition" from other nations—I understand the handicaps of isolation. But John Bull and Jonathan will come around speedily enough. Russia can get along without them, quite as well as they without her. Perhaps they will drop their foolish aloofness, if she ignores them. But Russia can get on. Her government is probably as secure as any in

Europe. I hear of no one who even dreams of a change.

Yesterday, I went to the Exposition—really a great show, the fringe of which I have only touched—I understand there are 6,000 peasants here every day in attendance at the Fair, who have come free. It costs them not a ruble for passage, for hotels, for entrance, for street cars, for anything. While here they are entertained, not by the government, but by various groups of workers, so as to create friendships between peasants and workers. This sort of ingenious social mixing is going on everywhere on a large scale. For example, all the former great health resorts on the Black sea and in the Caucasus are being managed by the Health Department, in the interest of the workers.

I saw the Stars and Stripes, Union Jack, Italian flags and other foreign emblems at the Fair, indicating that business is fast forgetting its prejudice of Russia. Why not recognize Russia? Better hurry up. If the nations engage in many more highway, wholesale robberies, like Corfu and the Ruhr, Russia and China may refuse to recognize them. So, better come in while the water is warm.

I found the Exposition by following a company of 50 boys and girls who were marching through the streets, for a Youth demonstration at the Fair. I guessed I would arrive, if I followed the young. My instinct was correct and I witnessed a demonstration—a physical drill of 4,000 young communist workers. They were dressed in colors—red, yellow, brown, white, pink—all in knicker-bockers and sandals—the men generally appearing as athletes stripped to the waist, and fully half of both sexes, bare-legged from knees to ankles. The drill was well done, to the music of a band, with a leader perched high on the roof of a great stand. These young people were playful before and between drills. They indulged frequently in tossing companions into the air. This is quite Russian. At least I never saw it done so much elsewhere. During the hour I sat in the grand-stand, I saw at least fifty boys and girls (mostly girls) thrown high—10 to 15 feet toward the sky. A Russian crowd will frequently throw a favorite orator or leader into the air. It occurred to me that Russians would be compelled to have buttons for their pockets, carry cheap watches and eschew wigs and false hair.

These 4000 communist youth represent a hundred thousand more in Moscow who are grouped in clubs, drilled in athletics, in debate, in loyalty to the Soviet Republic. Their physical and mental appearance indicated that Russia is on the way to becoming a powerful nation—if others will keep hands off.

(2) How Has the Russian Church Changed?

The question that has been uppermost in my mind since I came to Russia is, How has the Russian Church changed? What has happened to the Church since the Revolution?

I had a good chance to have an answer to that question today. The opportunity came unexpectedly—as most opportunities do. I started out to find Wladimir Lvoff at the big house of the Metropolitan Bishop. He it was who had kindly guided me about on Sunday, winding up at the great Cathedral. I could not have had a better guide, as he had for years been Grand Procurator of the Russian Church. Unfortunately, I found him suffering from a cold contracted on Sunday; but we adjourned to the big kitchen for "tea."

Scarcely were we seated when the door opened and in came Peter the Metropolitan of all Siberia, and along with him his deacon. It was the same Peter I had heard at the Cathedral on Sunday, in the consecration of a priest and in the presentation of the cross to be kissed by the faithful. Here he was sitting opposite me, while before him and his deacon were glasses of tea, a big loaf of bread and six inches of big sausage. He is a progressive and one of the leaders in the Church. Here was my chance, so through my good friend Lvoff I asked my question. How is the Orthodox Russian Church different since the Revolution? The man before me was one of the best answers I could have found in all Russia—and tomorrow he is leaving for Siberia. He is six feet three inches high, not forty years old, is of peasant family and leaped in one bound from the priesthood to the Metropolitan Chair.

1. "The first change is the marriage of the bishops," he replied to my question. "For example, I am married and yet a bishop." (A "Metropolitan" is a bishop of bishops.)
2. "A great creative energy has been let loose by the Revolution which is greatly affecting the Church."
3. "The Church is quite democratic now. Bishops, priests and laity now speak to each other as equals." (I was told that bishops and servitors ate together at the big clean table at which we sat.)
4. "The relation of the Church to the State is now quite different: they are separate entirely. The Church has no support from the State: it once received 30 million gold rubles annually from the State."
5. "Monasteries have been practically all closed, and nearly all nunneries." It is difficult to calculate the effect upon the Church of the elimination of the monks from power. Once only monks could be bishops. Now they have been cast out.
6. "A portion of the Church is quite agreeable to communism. Apart from the theory of communism being popular, it is noticeable that workers rather than fashionable people, are in evidence in the Church and its management.
7. When asked if there had been much change in the doctrines of the church, he replied, "Very little. However," he said, "there are progressives and conservatives. There would be some who, for example, believed that the world was made in six days, as related in Genesis; while others would think the 'days' meant 'epochs'." As for him, he said, he believed in "evolution" and "revolution" as describing the process of life.

He added that the churches are now poor, and, he trusted, correspondingly humble. They need Bibles.

(3) With Vidensky.

My friend Mr. Hecker arranged a little "tea" at the "Hermitage" for Sherwood Eddy, my daughter and myself, to have a chat with Archbishop Vidensky. He is perhaps the best pulpit orator in the Russian Church and he it was who played so prominent a part in the recent Church Council.

Imagine my surprise to be greeted by a young man of 33, dressed in no robes at all, but as might a spectator at a tennis-court. He came bare-headed and walking and looking like an intelligent instructor in an American university. It is evident—I have now chatted with Metropolitan Eudakim, Metropolitan Peter, and Archbishop Vidensky—that the progressive movement is a young man's movement. This is running to form I suspect.

When I asked Vidensky what proportions the progressive movement had assumed, he laughed and said, when he was recently lecturing someone sent up a note to him asking "If you were shot what would be left of the movement?"

Let me make clear at this point that the great religious movement in Russia is not a split into two or more churches but a conflict between progressives and reactionaries. At the present writing the progressives are in power.

"What would I have if I had my way?" responded

Vidensky. "I would have first an open Bible." This idea is expressed by other leaders. Application has already been made for a million New Testaments, with psalms from the American Bible Society. These will be distributed by the Church itself. "The second thing I would have is a New Moralty." I am not quite clear what he meant by a "New Moralty" except it included honesty, truthfulness and purity. A third important thing is training of the priests. The Church has not a single theological school in Russia, said Mr. Hecker. Rev. Eddy thought this was an error, as he saw a school of 100 students in Petrograd. This school I subsequently learned was a private school, not a Church school. "The fourth thing I would have if I had my way," said Vidensky, "is a social application of the Gospel."

"How many of your 50,000 priests preach?" I asked as I was anxious to know how much the pulpit was reaching the people. It must be remembered that the liturgy is the chief part of the "Service" and many priests only lead in the liturgy and do not preach at all. "I should say that 30% of the city priests preach, but taking all Russia not over 5 or 10% preach."

"How secure is the Revolutionary Government?" "I should say," he replied, "that this government had got hold of roots that reach deep (I think he meant the peasants and the workers) and it will continue unless overthrown from outside."

I was interested in a slant he gave on the Russian religious mind. We were discussing the kind of sermons that the priests should be encouraged to preach. I said that since there was a general attack on "religion," it would be a good thing to point out to the people what "real religion is, and to do this, how would it answer to propose some sermons on "The Religion of Jesus." He laughed and slightly shook his head and said, "The Russian people do not think of Jesus having a religion but that he is religion itself. Besides, he is referred to not as 'Jesus' but as 'Christ.'"

We said good-bye to the youthful archbishop at the street corner and went to hear Bishop Ilarion lecture. He is one of Tikhon's lieutenants and a reactionary. Admission was fifty cents. It was an attack on the progressive movement. The controversy is getting under way in the Church. After his lecture of an hour and a half, there was a recess of five minutes; after which there were 10 minute speakers who disagreed or agreed or were opposed to both progressives and conservatives. The liberty of speech was quite remarkable and applause was distributed according to hits made. This address will be formally answered in another packed hall—50 cents per—by former Procurativ Lvoff, Vidensky or other champion.

The Russian Orthodox Church is evidently in for a merry time, for decades to come: with progressives and conservatives battling for supremacy within; with an atheistic communistic party in power in government. It will all be good for her. More changes have already occurred to her, than ever to any other church, in the same period of time; monks have been eliminated; bishops marry; support and recognition by the State have been withdrawn; democracy among people, priests and bishops has been partially secured; great creative energy has been let loose. The Church is poor, very poor. The Church owns nothing, not even buildings for worship. The State in Russia owns all. The only revenue is from the people's contributions. The Churches use the buildings without rent. Occasionally one as St. Pieman is closed for alleged violation of law. In this case it was the making of Vodka, by the janitor, I am told. St. Pieman was afterwards turned over to the Young Communist Club of the neighborhood, who treated it somewhat as Cromwell's men treated the cathedrals of England.

(4) The Red Army.

I was standing in front of my hotel, on Tverskaya, with my friend Mr. Hecker an American, when a hundred horsemen of the Red Army passed. We took a look at them and I asked him, "What of the Red Army?" I am a pacifist yet I like to note the differences and any good points exhibited by militarism, in various lands.

"The soldiers of the Red Army," said Mr. Hecker, "are all citizens now. It was not so once. Officers once had their own clubs, and were saluted whenever passing. It is not so now. All are citizens and comrades.

"The soldiers can all read and write. Formerly fifty per cent were illiterate. Fully three fourths of the time of soldiers is now spent in study. When I was in the prison camps in Austria during the war, I found Russian soldiers who did not know what they were fighting for, they were so illiterate. It is different now.

"The Red soldiers are not hoodlums. They are trained to be gentlemen. My wife has just come from our summer place, near which was encamped a company of soldiers. There was no rowdyism, she said.

"The Red soldiers believe that because their neighbors will not demobilize they must be on guard. They are also taught that they are the protectors of the workers of the world.

"The Conscientious Objector to war is rather generously handled. Russia never was severe with these. In the first place there are so many millions in Russia that there is never lack of material. When a man resists conscription, he must prove that he is a real conscientious objector. This is first done before a board of his own church, not before a civil court."

"Is Russian becoming militaristic?" I asked. "I am sorry to say," he replied, "that a wave of militarism was started by Curzon's attacks. There is, for example, considerable enthusiasm over the creation of an air fleet. Russians do not like to fight, but the events of the past year have incited many of them to believe in ample preparation."

(5) The Y. M. C. A.

"Why is the Y. M. C. A. not in Russia?" I asked Sherwood Eddy. "There are two reasons," he said.

1. Because it is looked upon as capitalist organization. It receives its chief support from big capitalists and therefore must be counter-revolutionary. The Salvation Army was recently invited to leave Russia for the same reason. 2. During the war an Englishman posing as a Y. M. C. A. man acted as a spy and was subsequently knighted in England and also honored by the New York Y. M. C. A.

"There is another reason," added Mr. Hecker. "When the Y. M. C. A. was in Russia after the Revolution, Mr. Colton, who was in charge, was well liked. When however England and America put an embargo on Russia, Mr. Colton received orders to come out. The Soviet Government requested that he remain. The reply was given that the New York office stated that it required money. Thereupon the Soviet Government offered to grant $100,000 for the work. However the Y. M. C. A. was withdrawn. After that Y. M. C. A. men were found helping Kolchak's army. It will be a long time, I fear, before the Soviet Government can forget this. When the Y. M. C. A. withdrew its organization, it was formally tried in the courts and declared hostile to Russia and its property confiscated."

Sydney Strong.

The Disloyalty of Stambulisky

Soon after the death of Stambulisky the statement began to appear in Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic newspapers coming under my eyes in the Near East that a plot had been discovered, in which the fallen premier was implicated, to dethrone Boris III and to establish a Bulgarian republic. In order to prevent such a calamity it had been necessary to resort to revolutionary tactics. Here and there a connection was hinted at with the republican movement fostered by Raditch in Croatia. I could not help suspecting that this was a part of the official version handed out by the Tsankoff government to justify its ways to men, and that the highly dramatized tale of Stambulisky's last movements came from the same source. But I had no access to Bulgarian journals. The frequent references to the remarkable moderation of the new rulers in not putting to death, or even arresting, Stambulisky's wife (who could not be found) also seemed somewhat peculiar. Why should she be punished? Or what evidence of her husband's guilt would she be likely to have carried away?

Returning to Athens from Constantinople, July 16, my interest was aroused by a despatch from Sofia in that day's issue of *Eleftheros Logos*. The correspondent told of a fresh discovery. A document had been found, revealing beyond peradventure that Stambulisky was a traitor to his king and to his country. Seven type-written sheets had been given to the press. There was no signature. But a prime minister, fleeing for his life, might very naturally have been obliged to leave behind some compromising papers. These sheets contained nothing less incriminating than a roughly outlined sketch of a projected new constitution, not only for Bulgaria, which would have been bad enough, but for a Federation of South Slav States, which was far worse. The federal capital would be Belgrad, where the representatives of all the states would meet. But there would be local parliaments in "Sofia, Skoplie, Agram, Lubliana, Novisad, Sarajevo, Split, and Cetinje." Bulgaria would consequently have only a local parliament, while, in addition to the federal parliament, Serbia would have a state legislature in Skoplie or Uskub, the old capital. The Croatians would have theirs at Agram, now called Zagreb; the Slovenes, at Novisad, the former Neusatz; Carniola and Carinthia (when recovered from Italy), at Lubliana, until recently better known as Laibach; Bosnia and Herzegovina, at Sarajevo; Dalmatia, at Split, the Croatian pronunciation of Spalato; and Montenegro, at Cetinje. The sovereignty would be vested in the Serbian family of Karageorgevitch, which is today the only reigning Slavonic dynasty. In population the new state would be considerably larger than Czecho Slovakia, and compare favorably with Poland.

It is strange that the political junta which got into power by the methods now so popular in Southern Europe was not satisfied with the earlier explanation. Had not Bulgaria been saved from the horrible fate of becoming a republic? Why was it important that the once so dreaded "republican" should subsequently be made known to the world as a royalist, indeed, but as a man who in high position plotted the overthrow of his own sovereign in the interest of the monarch of a former enemy state, and the humiliation of his own country as a subordinate member of a federation, and no longer one of the sovereign and independent nations of the world? It almost looks as if the first reason for the *coup d'état,* calculated to allay the fears and enlist the sympathies of neighboring monarchies, was not altogether convincing, and that it became necessary to stamp Stambulisky, on different grounds, as a traitor, and besides as a politician particularly dangerous to the interests of Italy in the "redeemed" provinces, assigned to her by the Treaty of Versailles.

The genuineness of the document may be questioned. But assuming that Stambulisky at some time actually jotted down a sketch like this, does it necessarily indicate treasonable designs, or even reprehensible tendencies of thought, on his part? The emphasis on local autonomy shows that he cannot have been in collusion with Pashitch who struggles hard to maintain a strongly centralized government in Jugoslavia; and although on this point he would have been more in sympathy with Raditch, the Croatian has no use for the Karageorgevitch family. Is it not conceivable that a Bulgarian who truly loved his country might reflect on possible improvements of its constitution, or that a Bulgarian statesman might wisely consider the advantages that would accrue to his people by sacrificing the phantom of absolute sovereignty to which national pride so desperately clings for a closer union with other peoples, freedom of trade, and helpful coöperation, with ample guarantees of local autonomy?

It is naïve to suppose that the present revolutionary government is pro-German, or that it is willing to jeopardize the substantial gains secured by Stambulisky's conciliatory attitude toward the Allies. There is another document that possibly throws a clearer light on the motives which led to the revolution. It is a manifesto issued by the Society of Bulgarian Industrialists in Sofia, in which an ardent plea is made to all whose interests had suffered by the legislation in favor of farmers and laborers during the Stambulisky régime to rally effectively, and regardless of initial sacrifices, to the support of the new government. The allusion to "initial sacrifices" is probably a caution against insisting too early on a reduction of labor cost. Of this manifesto I found a Rumanian translation, at Constanza, in a conservative newspaper. Stambulisky's career had many flaws. His methods were sometimes high-handed. Former ministers were haled to court and put into jail. Radicals were alternately persecuted and encouraged. If at heart he was an idealist, his diplomatic training and experience made him an opportunist. To the extreme left his government, though supported by a strong majority in parliament, appeared as a dictatorship of the agrarian group of the bourgeoisie. But his real disloyalty seems to have been to "big business" rather than to the family of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha, or to the Bulgarian people, most of whom are farmers and wage-workers. The Bulgarians are not quite convinced, it would seem from recent events, that, when elections go the wrong way, it is expedient to shoot the prime minister and put some one else in his place. It is interesting to observe that the Allies are now willing to revise, or ignore, the Treaty of Neuilly so as to allow Tsankoff a larger army with which to fight against the discontented elements at home. As more drastic methods for the suppression of dissent seem necessary than Professor Tsankoff can stomach, the real power ap-

pears to be passing into the hands of Lazarov. The new type of dictatorship has its little day. As a dominant influence in the state, the kings are gone. The captains also will go, when the world is made safe for democracy. But that cannot be done by bayonets.

Cornell University. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

The Function of the Sermon in the Life of the Community*

The time is near at hand when a minister who stands in fear of giving his honest outlook will be discharged from a church. A minister is hired by the congregation not to represent the views of any section of the membership. They forbid him to echo back their own views. He is or should be hired to study in an independent manner the great field of modern ethics and religion. They ask him to secure the best up-to-date knowledge of the whole field of human conduct—the way it ought to be conducted—and then report back to them on Sunday and at the other services. In his report to the members, the church should give absolute independence of expression; it should demand of him that he express his honest outlook.

Religion was meant to go out into life; it was meant to be intensely and absorbingly interested in whatever belongs to the advancement of man. Theodore Parker once said: "Long before land and sea or earth had been charted, the invisible heavens and hells were mapped, and reported in detail." The waste of energies in remote futile pursuits, in chasing will-o-the-wisps, has been, still is, immense. But man is at last looking around him and the great emancipation of mankind is at least beginning.

I believe that first-class preaching has a great mission to accomplish. Preaching ought to be nothing less than a divine lever which will lift, or elicit, the noblest qualities of every church attendant. Man's higher energy—made alive and responsive, is the greatest potential factor for the betterment of the individual and the world. But there is no spirituality in mere glorious outlook, none at all, unless it is used for the advancement of the world. Numerous churches remind me of an old-fashioned water wheel in North Philadelphia which was allowed to revolve around mightily when the water from a dam was released every Sunday morning to keep the wheel from decay. The rushing water threw around about the rushing wheel a beautiful spray rainbow; the iridescent bubbles scintillated like many individuals at a church service; the ascending bubbles had all the appearance of being permanent institutions; —but in an hour or so, the mill ceased operating, and the bubbles fell back into the passive stream,—unreinforced by any pressure from the upper lake. *The needs of today* demand preaching the influence of which must be more interior than the willing of occasional good actions; it demands preaching which sinks down into a man like an artesian well-drill into the depths of the earth, producing "the eternal well within," from which good acts will come of themselves.

What has the preaching of the past centuries achieved? It has performed many services, it has also produced untoward results. It has not helped the world by improving its social structure very much, and it has not modified in any great measure the acquisitive atmosphere of daily life. As a police-power it has restrained many, but it has not produced a sufficient output of superior character. Live, and let live, has been its best motto, not live and help live. How can a "substituted righteousness" get on the inside of a man? Unless one was born with a superior nature, there was little higher quality in him. When the average church member becomes interested in civic reforms, he usually represents the class of reformers Roosevelt mentioned in his London address (on his return from Africa): who retard the possible by attempting the impossible. Throughout the ages, the majority of pulpits have been peevishly scolding at sin. Instead of getting people to outgrow it, according to the law of right direction or proper use, they have taught them to repress it. "If thy right hand offend thee, cut it off; if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out." Christian pulpits have preached against an abstract sort of sinning,—sinning against a theological conception of Jesus; the major sin has been a refusal to accept the atoning Christ as one Saviour. In other words it is a sinning against a theory inherited from the cruder past. The old time preaching often produced a church member who developed the old solid personal virtues, but who does not remember what a hard-fisted and bargain-driving individual he often was. It produced the most punctilious people ever known, and frequently the most ruthless in their social relations. Christendom has produced millions of good people,—hosts of them have been truly and thoroughly dedicated to the public welfare. However all of them have been by no means equally wise.

It is here a distinction needs to be made. There are seven degrees of goodness, extending all the way (to use a crude expression) from shinbone goodness to porterhouse, from the commonplace goodness to the mind of Christ. Commonplace goodness is still a glut on the moral market. It hinders the rightful work and influence of the church. Ordinary goodness has only a limited amount of sense, and in addition it has never grown that higher flower of the mind called judgment. It is usually waiting for the last judgment to receive its inheritance in this respect. The central message of early Christianity was "love." But that noble word has never received much clarification; its deeper, nobler meaning has not been worked out into an intelligent detail. For instance, how to love the community, how to love the causes that need our support, how to achieve the highest use of one's time. Many Christians have resembled the youth who falls in love at first sight;—it is "a grand and glorious feeling"; but after loving religiously in this way for a brief season of spiritual intoxication, he often ceases to be fundamentally religious for the rest of life.

The wife of a sordid mayor of a large American city said to me recently, "You ought to preach about God and leave politics alone." I answered that while the clergy were looking at the moon and the constellations, the politicians and interested parties would use both hands and swipe everything in sight. Conduct is at least three-fourths or four-fourths of life, and it is the business of the pulpit to develop a sense of sin in regard to failures to stand upright in the performance of everyday duties. Socrates had enough sound imagination to say: "If men could only see in advance the results of wrong conduct upon themselves and their fellowbeings, they would never do wrong." Preaching

*An Address delivered at the Western Unitarian Conference at Indianapolis, on May 16.

which can realize Socrates' idea, and portray the tragic results of private vices and sins against one's fellows (the community), has hardly made a beginning. *But, once this divine art is developed* and becomes the noble habit of numerous pulpits, the greatest day of religion will be here. When men actually see the chaos and ruin that personal and civic sins leave in their wake, they will be as much "broken-up" or "broken-down" as any sinner ever was in a successful Edwards, Finney or Moody revival. We will need larger and more substantial mourners' benches than the past has known. Men will feel the need of religion, they will cry aloud to be saved in the only sense worthy of the word. And there will be a genuine demand for our line of goods; instead of slimly attended churches, we may need twice the number to house the nobly interested multitudes.

Preaching that merely advertises beautiful ideals does not make the preacher a public benefactor. But preaching that can skillfully teach from the viewpoint of a noble self-interest will attract hundreds where a direct exhortation to live the spiritual life will usually leave one-half of the pews steadily empty. Channing, Parker, Emerson stirred the world because their message had the drive of an enlightened personal and societal self-interest. *The preacher is a moral referee;* his field is the science of right, and it must be applied to those centers where friction exists in human society. Unitarianism since Channing and Parker, has had too many sermons known as "wise" proclamations; they have lacked a sufficient emphasis upon the up-to-date needs of humanity. They have contained some important practical truths, but numerous amendments and neutralizing elements have often toned them down to a general characterless level. An aesthetic sermon is good for any time, but good for no time in particular. A sermon, like a doctor's diagnosis, must be specific. *Preaching which can change* the atmosphere of a city must be something more than wholesome generalizations. When preaching can fasten upon the minds of men the true meaning of Cosmic Providence and Human Providence in the order of evolution then the Human-Providence, men, God in the flesh, will play their part in the building up of the world as they have never sensed their task in the churches of the past. The spirit pervading Lowell's poem, "The Present Crisis," will then have a fair chance to get into the churches and inspire thousands, and a church member will become a spiritual and moral dynamo,—receiving his greatest power from the church, and connecting up his ethical electric power with the community to promote good-will, brotherhood, the Golden Rule, every service of the common good. Preaching to men who recognize themselves as human providences will inspire them to be alive to every human problem and responsive to every human call. A love for the welfare of all will glow within, and into every city, the glory and greatness of a better day will dawn.

We are living in a time of transition. In making the transition from the shores of orthodoxy to the coast of liberalism, this age is engulfed in a shallow sea of fadism. All sorts of unqualified Columbuses are advertising for the carrying of passengers to the land of the heart's desire. The short-cut routes of the psychological and healing cults are proving unsatisfactory to many of the voyagers. Many are having a cosmic seasickness, are throwing up their views, and issuing an S. O. S. call. The diluted liberalism, now, so characteristic of nearly all orthodox churches, is equally unsatisfactory to real men and women. Never was there a time when the real liberal churches had so much to gain by stressing the importance of the real, definite, approximate truth, and making good their claim to those significant words.

What is the real, definite and approximate truth in the field of religion? The answer will include the noble elements of all the historical religions; it will also realize that the later manifestations of the ethical spirit are at least equal to anything found in the religions of the past. Where is there a teacher in the so-called golden days of religion, who has conceived the magnificent task of religion as it is conceived today? What religious teacher of the past had *as clear and comprehensive a conception* as Emerson, Ruskin, Morris, Lester, Ward, of the elements that enter into a religion which can transform not only individuals, but the entire life of human society? The religious teaching of ancient Greece tried to make a refined, aesthetic individual in a small privileged class; the preaching in ancient Rome, at its best, was limited by the crystallized structure of the Empire. Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius viewed that structure as predestined, they did not have any insight into the power of religion to change the structure of the State, so that the State would serve in the only task for which it should exist: the production of men and women of goodwill, who in turn give their best to the betterment of the State. And even Christianity, with its ethics of suppression, has not had enough native force to affect powerfully the egoistic structure of human society. Its usual effect is the influence of a good religious man in the average American city. *A large part of his religious energy* is channeled away from practical life, in devotion to an anthropomorphic God, a perfect Christ who *can straighten out* all our problems if we fail; a Bible which has been so used that "one good custom will corrupt the world," for one book that is idolized diverts the average religionist's attention away from a hundred other grand books which represent the experience of modern men. It is only in recent years that scientific knowledge has furnished us the data for knowing the world and its actual needs. For the first time in history we have a real God—the great eternal spirit-energy of the worlds.

The majority of Christian pulpits have been fairly content if they could produce a noble atmosphere at the church service. We must have that, but long experience has made clear that man's political and social needs do not prosper when he trusts a holy atmosphere to produce the changes needed in a world where powerful selfish pressures are constantly forcing decisions, and thus preventing the incoming of a better order of things. Good pious men usually go up numerous blind alleys, if the pulpits fail to make the spiritual issues concrete. The pulpit must point out the actual, practical, moral avenues for the expression of the spiritual life. All the vital political and social issues in a city or state, represent the real religion avenues, and the pulpit must aid the modern religious pilgrim by setting up clear street-signs, on the highways of daily life, and those avenues, when well traveled by church people, will make the divine commonwealth of man, and keep him out of those blind alleys. This is the vision of the Kingdom of God of the ancients on modern foundations.

A great question that needs clarification from the pulpit is, "What is Righteousness?" The Christian

world, the Buddhists, all religions, agree as to the *desirability* of Righteousness,—but if we have no ideal of righteousness in any way different or in advance of theirs, we have not kept step with the accumulating needs of humanity. New and better rules of righteousness are needed to meet *the increasingly complex needs* of a totally different civilization,—an industrial civilization. We need to remember Channing's words to the Unitarians of one hundred years ago: "It is time," he said, "that as a class of Christians we should disappear, if we will not take our part in the great work of regenerating society." He meant Unitarianism to represent a moral advance by putting the practical interests of religion in the foreground. This session of the Western Conference is interested in a serious attempt to state in what the higher vital morality and growing social welfare consist (at this time in social evolution), and then for a serious and united endeavor to bring it to pass in the world. The average religious discussions are simply chaff compared with the living, crying needs of mankind. If we will address ourselves to the actual needs of men today, the world will hear us, will turn to us, as the flower turns to the sun.

There is a great call going up from the very heart of this present human world, that we give our first thoughts to it. A religion that gives its main strength to pleasant theological or philosophical views is doomed to gradual extinction.

The pulpits of Christendom have been constantly rehearsing year after year the ideas of God and another world. These have their proper place, but what is wanted, now, is the development of the idea of how to live in this world. As Thoreau was dying, hardly conscious of his passing, someone said to him, "Shall we pray?" He instantly murmured, "One world at a time." Men of the Thoreau type are now reminding us that we need a fresh, specialized and practical statement of an up-to-date moral law in terms of biology, history, the later interpretations of literature, sociology, and the evolutional psychology. The grave questions of bodily and moral health, of hereditary transmission, claims to an improved and perfected birth, are pressing themselves upon the consideration of all thoughtful minds. Intelligent religion is beginning to address itself to the diseases of society, how to cure the great patient, the social organism, and treat these diseases from the high vantage ground of actual knowledge, to approach them not to mitigate or alleviate, but to cure, by removal of the cause or causes. Religion is now intent on the inauguration of a better social order, of decent equity, abundance and world peace. The questions in our industrial world which are becoming pressing, burning questions, will have their solution through searching, decisive discussion of them, as we go along in the light of the needs of a growing humanity.

It is high time that religious people recognize the claims of ever higher and more concrete applications of justice and humanity, and *mean something by justice and humanity,* and not merely indulge in fine sentiment while the conscience sleeps. A truly religious man, I take it, is distinguished from the conventionally religious man as one who grasps morality in its inmost principle, and assents to the uttermost demands of the moral law upon him. This view of what makes a person fundamentally religious is of such transcendent importance that all theologies and philosophies are as chaff for the wind in comparison with it. We need a *fresh* publication of the requirements of right conduct (of behavior) in the actual circumstances of modern society; there must be a deepening and invigorating and enlightening of the moral sentiment; the still voice of conscience must be heard in a vital way, in earthquake fashion, in the midst of the tumult and chaos of these modern days.

We see religion then as necessarily identified with mental and spiritual enlargement, with continuous exalted purpose for a better society. It is life penetrated with thought, permeated with reverence, illumined, transfigured with ideal, and making real headway in victorious living,—personal and societal. In the desirableness of that moral aim, and toward the realization of it, we must give ourselves, and think and speak and work. And every step forward through the sciences, every step made in self-mastery, every advance wrought toward finer conditions and larger life for our fellow-beings will set new gems in the crown of a religion and pulpit which is dedicated to the service of a higher vital morality and a growing social welfare.

GEORGE GILMOUR.

TO C. F. D.

When the fierce passions of the tempest fall,
  When the portentous storm-clouds flee away,
  And over the ocean streams the joy of day,
Turning to iridescent filmy veils the pall
Of gloom that made the night funereal,
  Upon the granite reef amid the fray
  Of angry breakers stands the lighthouse gray,
Unshaken, unperturbed—a column tall.

So hast thou, Brother, through these brutal years
  Borne high aloft, undimmed, thy steady light
While at thee stormed the wrack of threats and jeers
  That strove to whelm thee with their senseless might.
But now at last, the tumult past, appears
  The glory of thy service for the Right.

NATHAN HASKELL DOLE.

THE WINDS OF GOD.

Earthquake and fire and wind, and then, so low
  It seemed a silence rather than a sound,
  A still, small voice, the voice of truth that found
The prophet's conscience. And men argue so
That truth is always gentle-voiced, and slow,
  Nor roars, nor burns, nor rends the quaking ground.
  But what if truth be not to calmness bound?
What if the cross be followed by the woe?
  With Roman eagles screaming their acclaim;
  The city where love failed a hell of flame.
    And what if they who laud love's patient ways
      Forget the vast explosiveness of wrong?
      If our own martyrs lie in jail too long
    Who dare deny the winds of God their praise?

ROBERT WHITAKER.

THE STUDY TABLE

"Anthony John"*

This book is another, added to the growing list of tales dealing with the gropings of man and woman toward the spiritual interpretation of life as contrasted with the purely physical.

There is much beauty in Mr. Jerome's story though his style at times is confusing. We suddenly come upon a break that has the effect of a jog. His characters act jerkily and do not explain their motives, but they do act and achieve and in the end we find a complete carrying out of a well-designed idea.

Anthony John, like most reformers—and he *is* a reformer, not only of conditions, but of himself—comes from The People. Like the Nazarene, his parents were humble working folk and his father's shop was his nursery.

Anthony John's birth almost cost his mother her life and after him came no other children. The mother was the practical member of the little family; the father was the dreamer. Anthony John looked to his mother for all that went to make life comfortable, but it was his father whom he loved.

There is beauty and charm in the child-life depicted in the sordid English town and sharply defined is the appeal in Anthony John that afterward led to his great success in love and business. People could not deny him—for he called forth love and confidence. And with the spiritual quality that dominated the boy and young man was the practical element that gave him strength to push his way; win education and social recognition against odds that would have defeated a lesser nature.

"I want him to be strong," his poor mother said at his birth; "it's a hard world for the weak."

Anthony John was strong and he flourished. He made his way with rich and poor: he was faithful to old ties and forged new ones.

"It was characteristic of him that knowing himself defeated, he bore no ill will to his conqueror."

This attribute made for success. There are good women characters in this book and they contribute always to Anthony John's progress. At no point was he ever turned from his course by the women he loved and who loved him.

His mother worked and earned that he might be fitted for life. The two young women who loved him did not fail him. The stronger stood aside and was glad for him when a deeper love than that which he bore for her, carried him from the center of her life—he never departed entirely from it. What was Anthony John's he never lost. The woman who became his wife had the possibilities of failure, but to her end she rallied at the soul call of Anthony John and as the years went on and the acid test of the world war tried men and women, the soul dominated this man of the people.

From life's experience Anthony John hacked and hewed a religion that became vital; a thing not to be denied or interpreted to fit his particular case. To him God was a God "needing man's help, unable without it to accomplish His purpose. A God calling to man as Christ beckoned to his disciples."

At first Anthony John bargained as the world's successful always do. This and that would he do for God. He would clean the tenements and build schools: he would organize labor and put it upon the profit-sharing basis.

All this did Anthony John do, but it did not satisfy his soul.

"God is within us. We are God." With this conclusion reached Anthony John makes no more bargains. For him there is no compromise.

"In Christ's voice we recognize the voice of God," and his one command was, "love one another."

With this point admitted, Anthony John sets his face to the Great Adventure.

> Some would fail. But others would succeed. It needs only a few to set the example. It would appeal to all generous men and women, to the young. Fighting for God. Fighting with God to save the world.

Then when Anthony decides to give up wealth and position he says:

> The whole trouble is that we have drawn a dividing line between our religion and our life.

There was a crucial hour when the high-born lovely wife of Anthony John regards his decision with the world-old argument—"He could do more with wealth and position than without it."

Her personal claim almost conquers her, but she rises to love's demand.

> To follow, heedless, where God's trumpet led.
> Somewhere—perhaps near, there lay the Promised Land. It might be theirs to find it—If not! Their feet should help mark the road.

And so Anthony John goes back among the people—a poor man. His talents and education are at their command. Foolish or wise; right or wrong, his soul finds peace and love does not desert him.

This book adds its mite to the surging thought that is touching the materialism of the past. Like the play "The Fool" it sets before the readers a shining possibility and its only proof of solution lies in the fact that Anthony John's soul found peace and after all what else in the world counts against that?

HARRIET T. COMSTOCK.

*"Anthony John," by Jerome K. Jerome. Dodd Mead & Co., New York, N. Y.

"Because Men Are Not Stones"

It is an accomplishment, especially for a citizen of America, to live for four score years. It is a greater accomplishment when, at the age of eighty-one, such a citizen writes a book. It is a still greater accomplishment when that book is as modern in its content as would be a similar work produced by a newly hooded doctor from a liberal university. It is an accomplishment par excellence when the work from such a citizen is enhanced and beautified by the experiences of his long life, and the skill derived from the previous writing of some twenty volumes. These words may sound naive in their flattery, but he who will take the time to verify them through reading "Because Men Are Not Stones,"* will agree that Dr. Jabez T. Sunderland deserves even greater laudation than has been bestowed. But let that reader, in order that his own praise may be unconditional, commence with the second essay and omit the sixth.

I am sorry that it is necessary to add the "but." So splendidly executed are the other chapters or essays in Dr. Sunderland's latest book, that it seems unkind to criticize these two. Yet I am confident that this work

* "Because Men Are Not Stones," by Jabez T. Sunderland. The Beacon Press. 164 pages.

by the distinguished Unitarian who has traveled so extensively and held so many city pulpits, would be much improved were these two essays either omitted or rewritten. The first, which deals with man's innate yearning for God is ambiguous in its use of the word "God." From its wording and the nature of its subject, the reader is easily led to believe that the author is attempting to defend the old school conception of the Deity. I admit that Dr. Sunderland does introduce interpretatives phrases at certain places, but these are not sufficient. It is not until the reader has finished the second essay, entitled, "The Higher Conception of God," that he is able to adjust himself, without confusion, to the author's many personifications of, and conventional phrases concerning the "Infinite, Eternal, Supreme, One—God." In consequence it is not until the reader has nearly completed this second essay that he is able to agree with the writer in his statements regarding the necessity of a God idea—statements frequently made in the first chapter or essay. Let me hasten to add, however, that in the second chapter, which is one of the most delightful in the book, Dr. Sunderland arrives at a definition of God which is bringing absolute satisfaction to an ever increasing body of modern, intelligent Christians. The more orthodox will accuse the author of being pantheistic in his religious philosophy, but those of the liberal faith will see in Dr. Sunderland's God concept a universal spirit as superior to the Christian God of pre-scientific days as was that God superior to the early anthropomorphic Yahweh of the Jewish nomadic period. This change which is taking place in the Christian God idea is not a change in the nature of God, but rather in the breadth of the Christian conception. Each century brings mankind a little nearer to actual facts; gives him a more accurate picture. The human race is advancing through the centuries from Paul's first dim, confusing, mirror vision out into that face to face knowledge. The higher conception of God, as portrayed by the author, is:

A sense sublime,
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thoughts,
And rolls through all things.

Passing over three excellent essays on "God and Life's Deep Experiences," "God and Human Sorrow," "God and Great Calamities," all of which are fresh, vivid and delightful in their treatment, as well as being pregnant with Christianity's latest and best teaching on some of our profoundest religious problems, we come to the sixth. It is in this chapter that Dr. Sunderland refers to that statement from Robert Ingersoll in which he said that had he been God he could have made a better world by, for one thing, making "health catching instead of disease." It is, I think, plain that the word "catching" as used by Mr. Ingersoll carries the popular connotation of something contagious as an infectious disease. For Dr. Sunderland to build up a lengthy argument attempting to prove that Mr. Ingersoll by this statement contradicted the "law of evolution" and placed himself "on the same ground with John Calvin," is to quibble over terms. The author makes this accusation through interpreting the word "catching" as being applicable to health as well as to disease. Dr. Sunderland has a right to look upon health as "catching," but inasmuch as Robert Ingersoll had in mind an entirely different type of contagion, the argument seems regrettable, and at best a rather pathetic effort to rob poor Mr. Ingersoll of a much needed rest from religious controversy.

The remaining two chapters of this small volume, entitled "God Who Knows and Cares," and "Working With God," have a direct bearing on the author's dominant theme, which is to present in the form of carefully written reflective essays, liberal Christianity's latest and best contributions to religious thought in reference to certain perplexing problems. And few, if any, have done this task more artistically. Dr. Sunderland has approached his subject as a man of letters, not as a technically trained theologian. The abundant use of well selected poetry is a feature worthy of highest commendation, for it adds much to the book's literary value. It is interesting to note that Dr. Clarence A. Beckwith, in his recent book on "The Idea of God," resorted to a similar practice.

"Because Men Are Not Stones" (the title will irritate the sensitive), should be read slowly, meditatively, as a devotional work, for although it is easy reading, it is, nevertheless, thought provoking, stimulating, and persuasive. May its author live to give America another volume of equal merit.

EDWARD ARTHUR ROCKWOOD.

CORRESPONDENCE

REGARDING UNIVERSITIES AND "ACQUIRED CHARACTERS."

Editor of UNITY:

Apropos of one thing or another, let me say that because of the atrocity at Amherst and the stupidity at Clark, it is not fair to blame all of us by saying that "our colleges stand under a heavier indictment of betrayal than before." There are many colleges and on the whole no stronger influences for truth and freedom exist than inside their walls.

Universities are always beset, and most of all in war-time by three perennial pests, the Pharisee, the Philistine and the Charlatan. As Liberals, we can make no greater mistake than to accept the last-named class as our associates in the cause of freedom. It is quite impossible now as of yore "to serve God with a lie," and the first duty of a reformer is to tell the truth about men and actions. This the charlatan never tries to do.

The note in UNITY concerning the "rout" of Weismann jars on my nerves. No doubt, Dr. Kammerer is a very able observer and his recent studies on the dimorphism (land and water) of certain salamanders is very interesting and important. The common *Newt* or *Eft* of New England (scarlet when land-bred; brown when aquatic) seems a similar case.

But it is not clear that this case of "ontogenetic forms" has any bearing on the question of "Acquired Characters," as defined by Weismann. And its final meaning, as well as that of Guyer's experiments on the mutilation of the eye in rabbits, is yet to be shown.

In any case, this experiment can lend no strength to Spencer's conclusion that results of mind-training are transmissible or that instinct is inherited habit. It may be so, but we shall never know until we find out and scientific men alike rejoice when a truth appears clearly out of the maze of opinion.

Very truly yours,
DAVID STARR JORDAN.

PERPETUATING A DANGEROUS FALLACY.

Editor of UNITY:

Lord Birkenhead is reported as saying recently at the Institute of Politics at Williamstown: "The circumstances amid which the great war arose were astonishing enough. About twelve very unscrupulous, but very powerful, men decided, sitting around a table, that there should be war. They deliberated very privately in Berlin. . . . These twelve narrow, ignorant, arrogant men pronounced in favor of war. Their decisions psychologically had only to consider a weak monarch and a dis-

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

WORLD COURT MAIN THEME OF NATIONAL CHURCH CONGRESS

Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 9th.—President Harding's words, "to remind the world anew that we are ready for our part in furthering peace and adding to stability in world affairs," will head the program of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches to be held here on Nov. 13, 14 and 15. The Philadelphia Church Federation is co-operating in the arrangements and will act as host of the occasion.

The congress is announced as one "on America and the Permanent Court of International Justice." The speakers and delegates will come from all parts of the world and most of the twenty-seven national councils of the World Alliance will be represented.

Churchmen, diplomats, college presidents, jurists, explorers and educators will be on the program. Dr. Fridtjoff Nansen, Arctic explorer, who is now engaged in humanitarian work for the League of Nations, will discuss "International Humanitarian Effort." Other prominent foreigners on the program are Nathan Soderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, Sweden; the Rev. T. G. Brierley Kay, of London; His Grace the Archbishop Panteleimon Athanassiades of the Eastern Orthodox Church, and the Rev. Thomas Nightingale, Secretary of the National Free Church Council of Great Britain.

The program follows:

Tuesday, November 13, 1923

Afternoon Session—2:30 O'clock. Rose Room, Bellevue Stratford Hotel.
Presiding Officer: Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.
Devotional Exercises.
Registration of Delegates.
Reports of Officers:
Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, General Secretary.
Dr. Frederick Lynch, Educational Secretary.
Dr. Sidney L. Gulick, Secretary Oriental Relations.
4:30 O'clock—
Address — Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D.
Address — Prof. William Adams Brown, D.D.
Evening Session—7:00 O'clock. Dinner. Ball Room, Bellevue Stratford Hotel.
Presiding Officer: Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D.
Topic — "A Constructive Program for Peace."
Speakers: Hon. Oscar Straus, Justice John H. Clarke, President A. Lawrence Lowell, President Mary E. Woolley.

Wednesday, November 14, 1923

Morning Session—9:30 O'clock.
Presiding Officer: Rev. Arthur J. Brown, D.D.
Topic — "The Church Co-operating Across National Borders."
Reception of delegates from the World Alliance in sister countries:
Most Reverend the Archbishop of Upsala, Nathan Soderblom, D.D., Sweden.
Rev. T. G. Brierley Kay, Great Britain.
His Grace the Archbishop Panteleimon Athanassiades, Eastern Orthodox Church.
M. le Pasteur J. Jezequel, France.
Representative from Germany.
Rev. Geza Takaro, Hungary.
Dr. Y. Y. Tsu, China.
Representative from Japan.
Response by Bishop W. M. Bell, D.D.
Afternoon Session—1:00 O'clock.
Luncheon and Conference on a Concrete Community Program.
Presiding Officer: Mrs. Frank F. Williams.
3:30 O'clock—Open Air Meeting on Steps of Independence Hall. (Weather not permitting, this meeting will be held at the Bellevue Stratford Hotel.)
Presiding Officer: Rev. Edward Cummings.

---

loyal Crown Prince. They triumphed, and from their triumph proceed the devastating consequences."

Such a mischievous and disproved statement as this from so influential and eminent a man should receive a stinging rebuke. If there is anything made clear by the documents which have come from the Russian, Austrian and German archives since the war, it is that the war had a complex origin and that no one nation or any group in any one nation was solely responsible. Signor Nitti, the former premier of Italy, pronounces Russia as responsible as Germany, and even more responsible for the war's immediate precipitation. The prime marplot was Berchtold of Austria who deliberately kept from the German government essential facts until he had compromised Germany to a point from which she could hardly save herself. Nitti has written two important books dealing with the origin of the war. A little group in Germany, of course, bear grave responsibility; but the notion that twelve arrogant men plotted a world war is a myth, based probably on the exploded story of a meeting at Potsdam on July 5, to concoct a scheme to start a war for world domination by Germany.

In England itself, Lord Birkenhead's eminent predecessors in the Lord Chancellorship, Lord Loreburn and Lord Haldane, have both strongly contended against the position here taken by Lord Birkenhead, even publishing important books about the origin of the war. Lord Loreburn devoted a large share of his book to emphasizing Great Britain's share in the responsibility. Similar position has been taken by the distinguished Cambridge professors, G. Lowes Dickinson and Bertrand Russell, the yet more eminent Oxford scholar, Gilbert Murray, the eminent English economist, John A. Hobson, to say nothing of men like E. D. Morel and Ramsay Macdonald. It must never be forgotten that Lord Morley and John Burns resigned from the ministry because they could not support the government in entering the war and that they have never retracted their condemnation.

In America, Prof. Sidney B. Fay of Smith College in his remarkable series of articles in the *American Historical Review*, together with many other American thinkers, has equally demonstrated the truth of the words of Lord Birkenhead's chief, Lloyd George, when he said, December 20, 1920: *"The more one reads memoirs and books written in the various countries of what happened before August* 1, 1914, *the more one realizes that no one at the head of affairs quite meant war. It was something into which they glided, or rather, staggered and stumbled."*

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

ANOTHER "TEST CASE."

Editor of UNITY:

. . . I see in the last issue of UNITY received, a letter from Germany, evidently written by a German, in which he says that the French occupation of the Ruhr "was a test case for 'decent' nations to thoroughly, immediately and unwaveringly protest against this action."

Do you not think that the horrible and hideous tragedy of Smyrna was a greater test case? The battleships of great Christian nations—American, British, French, Italian—stood in array in Smyrna harbor while for three days and nights murdering and plundering of Armenians and Greeks were being carried on by the Turkish soldiers, who finally set fire to the city; then, when the Greeks and Armenians were driven to the quay from the burning city, killing and looting, and worse still, violations of girls and women continued on the quay for days and nights, but the battleships in the harbor a few yards away remained indifferent to the fate of all these poor Christians: thousands were massacred in Smyrna City, thousands driven into the interior and killed there; but at Lausanne representatives of great Christian governments went down on their knees and kissed the crime gangrened feet of the Turks.

Smyrna is just as much Greek, and Cilicia is just as much Armenian, as Germany is German. Forty-five thousand Armenians were massacred in Cilicia after the Armistice. In Smyrna (the Greek city) about twenty thousand Armenians were done to death, not by our fellow sufferers the Greeks, but by the Turks to whom Christendom now is paying homage.

Tens of thousands, and hundreds of thousands of Greeks, were done to death in all the Asia Minor coast cities which are as much Greek as Germany is German, and the Greek Metropolitan of Smyrna was crucified on his own church doors by Turkish soldiers after first having his eyes gouged out, his teeth and hair pulled out, and his body shamefully mutilated. These are all recent happenings, and they followed a series of unprecedented horrors in the immediate years past.

We have no dance halls in Armenia. No! the owl and the jackal hoot and howl in a desolated country.

Yours truly and cordially,

Yokohama, Japan. DIANA AGABEG APCAR.

Topic—"America and World Interdependence."
Address—Mrs. Edgerton Parsons.
Address—Mr. Fred B. Smith.

Evening Session—8:00 O'clock.
Presiding Officer: Rt. Rev. Ethelbert Talbot.
Address—Most Rev. the Archbishop of Upsala.
Topic—"Europe's Need—America's Opportunity."
Address—Prof. Manley O. Hudson.
Topic—"The Permanent Court of International Justice and International Life."
Address—Governor Wm. E. Sweet.
Topic—"A Valid Christianity for Today."

Thursday, November 15, 1923

Morning Session—9:30 O'clock.
Presiding Officer: Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.
Open Parliament: The World Alliance and Its Plans for America
(a) Shall we establish regional groups?
(b) Shall we further the organization of local branches?
(c) Co-operation with existing groups.
Address—Rabbi Jacob Goldstein.
Address—Captain Edward L. Beach.
Discussion.

12:30 O'clock—
Address—Bishop James Cannon, Jr.
Topic—"American Friendship Expressed in Relief for the Suffering and Needy People of the World."

Afternoon Session—2:30 O'clock.
World Alliance Business. Election of Directors and Officers. Place of Meeting in 1924.
Address—Mr. Will Irwin.
Topic—"Christ or Mars?"
Address—Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D.
Topic—"Mobilizing for Peace."

Evening Session—8:00 O'clock. The Metropolitan Opera House. Public Meeting.
Topic—"International Co-operation in Humanitarian Effort."
Speakers—Dr. Fridtjoff Nansen, Mr. Raymond Fosdick.

The Committee of Arrangements for the Philadelphia Federation of Churches is as follows: Mr. W. Beatty Jennings, Mr. Frank B. Lynch, Miss Mary Johns Hopper, Mr. Edward H. Bonsall, Mr. Walter M. Wood, Rev. Herbert E. Benton, Rev. S. D. Daugherty, Rev. E. A. E. Palmquist, Mr. Alfred Scattergood, Mr. John Voll, Robert E. Tracey, Mrs. Mildred Scott Olmstead, and Mr. Rowe Stewart.

The leading national church organizations of the country and the principal societies and organizations engaged in international work have been invited to send delegates.

It's a "Case" of Necessity
Your Printing will be above criticism if done by
THE OAKLAND PRESS
3913 Cottage Grove
Tel., Atlantic 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY
STEAM—DOMESTIC
COAL
TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.
PRINTERS and BINDERS
Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Scrupulous Care
Nothing is left undone to protect the purity of BOWMAN'S MILK.
Frequent inspections, perfect pasteurization and rapid, direct delivery contribute to the safety of BOWMAN'S MILK.
BOWMAN DAIRY Company

DREXEL State Bank
Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.
Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .
Your savings and checking account cordially invited
Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company
Cleaners of
Fancy Gowns and Kid Gloves
Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth
Phone Drexel 0231
All Departments
MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue